

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 17 2008

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

The Office has rejected claims 1-12, 14, 16-26, 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §101, at paragraph 2 of the Final Action, as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites a service support system configured to produce a useful concrete and tangible result, e.g., to notify a technician of the first service request via the dispatch system interface, and to assign a second service request to the technician. The service support system may be a computer server system having one or more processors, various memory and storage systems, and program modules. See Applicants' Specification, paragraph 0017. Therefore, claim 1 constitutes allowable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1, and therefore constitute allowable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Independent claim 14 recites a work force administration system including a memory, the system configured to produce a useful concrete and tangible result, e.g., to assign at least one task of a service order to a technician. Therefore, claim 14 constitutes allowable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 14, and therefore constitute allowable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Independent claim 18 recites a system including a memory, the system configured to produce a useful concrete and tangible result, e.g., to assign a first task of a service request and to assign a second task of the service request, and to provide an order status associated with the service request. Therefore, claim 18 constitutes allowable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 19-26 depend from claim 18, and therefore constitute allowable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Independent claim 28 recites a service order status interface including a memory, the service order status interface configured to produce a useful concrete and tangible result, e.g., to display a service request status associated with a service request. Therefore, claim 28 constitutes allowable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 29 depends from claim 28, and therefore constitutes allowable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16, 17, and 30, and 32-36 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-12, 14, 16, 17, and 30-36, at paragraphs 16-17 of the Final Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Weigel, Don; Cao, Buyang; "Applying GIS and OR Techniques to Solve Sears Technician-Dispatching and Home-Delivery Problems," Jan/Feb 1999, Interfaces, 29, 1; ABI/INFORM Global pp. 112-130 ("Weigel") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,607 ("Bogart"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,005 ("Lesaint"). Applicants have previously canceled claim 31 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

The cited portions of Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Weigel do not disclose or suggest assigning a first service request to a technician based at least in part on a first current location of the technician, as in claim 1. Instead, Weigel discloses a system that determines an Origin-Destination matrix for resource assignment, in which each truck driver starts and ends at the delivery center. See Weigel, p. 118, col. 2, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-4. Applicants submit that assigning a service request based on initial location at the beginning of a route, as in Weigel, is different than assigning a service request based on the current location of the technician. In further contrast to claim 1, Weigel determines OD matrices by utilizing parameters including a technician's skills, minimum impedance, maximum impedance, minimum candidate (minimum number of locations the technician should reach from a starting location), and maximum candidate (maximum number of locations the technician can reach from a starting location). See Weigel, p. 119, col. 1, lines 9-22. In Weigel, the first service request is not assigned to a technician based on a first current location of the technician. Further, Bogart does not disclose or suggest assigning a first service request to a technician based at least in part on a first current location of the technician, as in claim 1. Instead, Bogart discloses generating a service profile for skill X for agent Z, determining which agents are available or nearly available, and selects the agent with the best combined score to handle the call. See Bogart, col. 5, lines 36-67. Additionally, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest assigning a first service request to a technician based at least in part on a first current location of the technician, as in claim 1. Instead, Lesaint discloses providing initial information relating to tasks to be allocated and resources available, providing updated information relating to the tasks and resources and modifying an initial schedule in response to the updated information. See Lesaint, col. 3, lines 11-28. In Lesaint, a

provisional schedule may be calculated for a technician, which may change if the technician reports a task completion early, or fails to report at an estimated time of completion, or if new tasks are requested after the provisional schedule has been created. *See* Lesaint, col., 8, lines 12-17. Lesaint does not disclose assigning a service request based at least in part on a first current location of the technician. Therefore, Weigel, Bogart, and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-12 and 42 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of claims 2-12 and 42. Accordingly, claims 2-12 and 42 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

In addition, the dependent claims include features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For example, Weigel does not disclose or suggest a geo-location interface configured to access a global positioning system, the global positioning system indicating a first current location of the technician, a second current location of the technician, or any combination thereof, as in claim 2. In contrast to claim 2, Weigel discloses using geographic information system techniques and data to build an origin-destination (OD) matrix based on locations associated with service order and deliveries. *See* Weigel, page 118. Weigel does not disclose or suggest accessing a global positioning system indicating the first current location of a technician, the second current location of the technician, or any combination thereof. Further, Bogart does not disclose or suggest this element. Instead, Bogart discloses generating a service profile for skill X for agent Z, determining which agents are available or nearly available, and selects the agent with the best combined score to handle the call. *See* Bogart, col. 5, lines 36-67. Further, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest accessing a global positioning system indicating the first current location of a technician, the second current location of the technician, or any combination thereof, as in claim 2. For this additional reason, claim 2 is allowable.

Further, Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a service request status interface that is accessible to one entity (the CLEC) and a technician assigned to the service request who is associated with a second entity (the ILEC), as in claim 5. For this additional reason, claim 5 is allowable.

Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 14. For example, Weigel does not disclose or suggest a dispatch module configured to assign at least one task of a service order to a technician while the technician is engaged in the current task, as in claim 14. Rather, Weigel discloses assigning routes before dispatching service or delivery personnel, based on parameters including the technician's skills, on minimum time a technician must travel, maximum allowed time a technician can travel from one location to another, minimum number of locations the technician should reach from a starting location, and the maximum number of locations the technician can reach from a starting location. *See* Weigel, page 119, col. 1, lines 9-22. Further, Bogart also does not disclose a dispatch module configured to assign at least one task of a service order to a technician while the technician is engaged in the current task, as in claim 14. Instead, Bogart discloses that upon an agent becoming available or arriving at the head of one of the agent queues, a selector determines which skills the idle agent possesses and which of those skills have non-empty corresponding call queues. *See* Bogart, col. 6, lines 12-19. Further, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest a dispatch module configured to assign at least one task of a service order to a technician while the technician is engaged in the current task, as in claim 14. Instead, Lesaint discloses that technicians can use their terminals for reporting completion of a task and for receiving instructions from a computer for performing the next task. *See* Lesaint, col. 7, lines 19-22. Therefore, Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 14. Hence, claim 14 is allowable.

Claims 16-17 depend from claim 14, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of claims 16-17. Accordingly, claims 16-17 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 14.

Further, the dependent claims recite additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For example, Weigel does not disclose or suggest a dispatch module that utilizes a global positioning system location associated with the technician to formulate the dispatch instructions, as in claim 16. Instead, Weigel discloses using geographic information system techniques and data to build an origin-destination (OD) matrix based on locations associated with service order and deliveries. *See* Weigel, page 118. Further, Bogart

does not disclose or suggest this element. Instead, Bogart discloses selecting the agent with the best combined score to handle the call, where the factors of a service profile include expertise, proficiency, profitability, etc. *See* Bogart, col. 5, lines 18-67. Further, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest a dispatch module that utilizes a global positioning system location associated with the technician to formulate the dispatch instructions, as in claim 16. Instead, Lesaint discloses considering traveling time necessary to reach a location of a task from present location. *See* Lesaint, col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4. For this additional reason, claim 16 is allowable.

Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 30. The Office Action admits that Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint do not disclose or suggest determining a current location of a technician of a plurality of available technicians based on near real-time Global Positioning System data, as in claim 30. *See* Office Action, page 21.

The Office Action states that near real time global positioning system is old and well known in the art to provide location indications of users carrying such devices in the field. Applicants traverse this statement. It is never appropriate to rely solely on "common knowledge" in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based. *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697. The Examiner must provide specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support his or her conclusion of common knowledge. *See Soli*, 317 F.2d at 946, 37 USPQ at 801; *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 (emphasis added). Applicants submit that the Office has failed to provide specific factual findings to support a conclusion of common knowledge in this instance.

The Office cannot rely on conclusory statements when dealing with particular combinations of prior art and specific claims, but must set forth the rationale on which it relies. *See* MPEP 2144.03 (B), and *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697. Applicants submit that the Office has not presented any rationale to support combining a near real time global positioning system (GPS) with the disclosures of Weigel, Lesaint and Bogart. Further, the Office has not indicated how a GPS might be combined with the disclosures of Weigel, Lesaint and Bogart, or whether the references would be compatible with GPS, and whether the

combination would be expected to produce a successful result. Hence, the Office has not provided a rationale to reject claim 30.

Further, Weigel does not disclose or suggest assigning a first service request to a technician based at least in part on a current location of the technician, as in claim 30. Instead, Weigel discloses a system that determines an Origin-Destination matrix for resource assignment, in which each truck driver starts and ends at the delivery center. *See* Weigel, p. 118, col. 2, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-4. Weigel determines OD matrices by utilizing parameters including technician's skills, minimum impedance (the minimum time (distance) a technician must travel), maximum impedance (the maximum allowed time (distance) a technician can travel from one location to another), minimum candidate (minimum number of locations the technician should reach from a starting location), and maximum candidate (maximum number of locations the technician can reach from a starting location). *See* Weigel, p. 119, col. 1, lines 9-22. In contrast to claim 30, in Weigel, the first service request is not assigned to a technician based at least in part on a current location of the technician. Further, Bogart does not disclose or suggest assigning a first service request to a technician based at least in part on a current location of the technician, as in claim 1. Instead, Bogart discloses generating a service profile for skill X for agent Z, determining which agents are available or nearly available, and selecting the agent with the best combined score to handle the call. *See* Bogart, col. 5, lines 36-67. Additionally, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest assigning a first service request to a technician based at least in part on a current location of the technician, as in claim 30. Instead, Lesaint discloses providing initial information relating to tasks to be allocated and resources available, providing updated information relating to the tasks and resources and modifying an initial schedule in response to the updated information. *See* Lesaint, col. 3, lines 11-28. In Lesaint, a provisional schedule may be calculated for a technician, which may change if the technician reports a task completion early, or fails to report at an estimated time of completion, or if new tasks are requested after the provisional schedule has been created. *See* Lesaint, col., 8, lines 12-17. Lesaint does not disclose assigning a service request based at least in part on a current location of the technician. Therefore, Weigel, Bogart, and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 30.

For at least the reasons provided above, Applicants submit that claim 30 is allowable. Claims 32-36 depend from claim 30, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, claims 32-36 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 30.

Further, the dependent claims recite additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For example, the Office Action states that claim 34 is rejected under a similar rationale as one or more of claims 1-12. Applicants submit that the cited portions of Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint fail to disclose or suggest a service request status interface that is accessible to a competitive local exchange carrier, as in claim 34.

The Office Action takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art that a service request status interface is accessible to a competitive local exchange carrier. *See* Office Action, page 15. Applicants respectfully traverse the Official Notice. It is never appropriate to rely solely on "common knowledge" in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based. *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697. The Examiner must provide specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support his or her conclusion of common knowledge. *See Soli*, 317 F.2d at 946, 37 USPQ at 801; *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 (emphasis added). Applicants submit that the Office has failed to provide support for a conclusion of common knowledge in this instance. For this additional reason, claim 34 is allowable.

Additionally, with regard to claims 1-12, 14, 16, 17, 30, 32-36 and 42, there is no rationale to combine Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint. "Determination of obviousness can not be based on the hindsight combination of components selectively culled from the prior art to fit the parameters of the patented invention. There must be a teaching or suggestion within the prior art, or within the general knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention, to look to particular sources of information, to select particular elements, and to combine them in the way they were combined by the inventor." *ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.*, 159 F.3d 534, 48 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998), *see also KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ____ (2007) No. 04-1350, citing *Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg & Supply Co.*, 332 F.2d 406, 412 (1964) (warning against a "temptation to read into the prior art the teachings of the invention in issue").

Weigel is directed to a system that generates and optimizes routes for service and delivery personnel before the personnel have started their routes. *See* Weigel, page 112. In contrast to Weigel, Bogart is directed to a call center call distribution system that assigns calls to call center agents based on data indicating each agent's ability to handle a particular incoming call. *See* Bogart, col. 3, lines 11-26. In contrast to Weigel and Bogart, Lesaint is directed toward generating initial schedules and modifying the initial schedules in response to receipt of data between periodic generation of the initial schedules. *See* Lesaint, col. 3, lines 35-38. Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint address different and unrelated problems. Neither Weigel, nor Bogart, nor Lesaint disclose or suggest any motivation to combine the delivery and service route generator of Weigel, with the call center call distribution system of Bogart, and with the schedule updating method of Lesaint. Therefore, the only motivation to look to the particular references, to select the particular elements cited in the Office Action, and to combine them in the manner stated in the Office Action comes from Applicants' disclosure. This constitutes an impermissible hindsight rejection based on Applicants' disclosure. Hence, the rejection of claims 1-12, 14, 16, 17, 30-36, and 42 over the combination of Weigel, Bogart and Lesaint is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 18-26, 28, 29, 38 and 39 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 18-26, 28, 29, 38, and 39, at paragraph 15 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over "NYNEX utilizes PEN*KEY@ mobile computers to retrieve information and execute transfer activity," pages 1-4, retrieved from: web.archive.org/web/19980206125452/www.norand.com/case_nynex_more.html ("Norand Reference A"); "Tech X-press," pages 1-2, retrieved from: web.archive.org/web/19980206122627/www.norand.com/sol_fieldservice_tech.html ("Norand Reference B"); "Are You Getting Ready to Catch the Wireless Wave?" pages 1-8 retrieved from: web.archive.org/web/19980206122343/www.norand.com/wp_wirelesswave.html ("Norand Reference C"); and "Introducing the Norand RapidREP™ Solution from Intermec Technologies Corporation," retrieved from: web.archive.org/web/19980206114807/www.norand.com/pr_rapidrep.html ("Norand Reference D"), in view of Lesaint. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of Norand Reference A, Norand Reference B, Norand Reference C, and Norand Reference D (the "Norand References"), and Lesaint do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 18. For example, the cited portions of the Norand References do not disclose or suggest an assignment module configured to assign a first task of a service request via a mobile technician interface and to assign a second task of the service request via a frame order management system interface, as in claim 18. In contrast to claim 18, Norand Reference A discloses transferring a copper phone line to a fiber optic phone line according to inputs entered at a remote hand-held computer. See Norand Reference A, page 2, paragraphs 2 and 6. Norand reference A does not disclose an assignment module configured to assign a first task of a service request via the mobile technician interface and to assign a second task of the service request via the frame order management system interface. Further, the cited portions of Norand Reference B, Norand Reference C, and Norand Reference D do not disclose or suggest an assignment module configured to assign a first task of a service request via the mobile technician interface and to assign a second task of the service request via the frame order management system interface, as in claim 18. Further, Lesaint does not disclose this element of claim 18. Instead, Lesaint discloses a schedule modification system to make changes in the short time between schedule updates delivered by a schedule generation system. See Lesaint, Abstract.

Further, the Office Action admits that the Norand References do not disclose or suggest assigning requests through two different interfaces, i.e., a mobile technician interface and a frame order management system interface, as in claim 18. The Office Action states that it is old and well known in the art that making functionalities separate that were integral does not make the differences patentably distinct. See Office Action, page 25. Applicants traverse the obviousness rejection. It is never appropriate to rely solely on "common knowledge" in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based. *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697. The board cannot rely on conclusory statements when dealing with particular combinations of prior art and specific claims, but must set forth the rationale on which it relies. See MPEP 2144.03 (B), and *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697. Applicants submit that a mobile technician interface differs from a frame order management system interface that can access a frame operations management system. For example, a frame order management system can provide a method of directing manipulation of

central office equipment management systems and receiving status information associated with a request. Further, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest this element of claim 18. Therefore, the Office Action has failed to demonstrate obviousness regarding claim 18.

Further, the cited portions of the Norand References do not disclose or suggest a web-based order status reporting interface, as in claim 18. Instead, the cited portions of Norand reference D discloses real-time wireless communications between dispatcher and field. See Norand Reference D, page 1 paragraph 2, page 2 paragraph 1. Further, the cited portions of Norand References A, B and C, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a web-based order status reporting interface. Additionally, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest a web-based order status reporting interface.

For at least the reasons presented above, claim 18 is allowable. Claims 19-26 depend from claim 18, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence the Norand References and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of claims 19-26. Accordingly, claims 19-26 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 18.

Further, the dependent claims recite additional features that are not disclosed by the cited references. For example, the cited portions of the Norand References do not disclose or suggest an inventory provisioning interface configured to access a public switch telephone network inventory system, as in claim 25. Further, the cited portions of Lesaint do not disclose or suggest this element of claim 25. Therefore, Norand References A, B, C, D, and Lesaint, separately or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 25. For this additional reason, claim 25 is allowable.

The cited portions of Norand References and Lesaint, separately or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 28. For example, the cited portions of the Norand References do not disclose or suggest at least one web page that is configured to display a service request status that is provided by an order status monitoring module associated with service order completion data and frame order completion data, as in claim 28. In contrast to claim 28, Norand Reference A discloses transferring a copper phone line to a fiber optic phone line according to inputs entered at a remote hand-held computer via a digital switch at a central

office. (See Norand Reference A, page 2, paragraph 6). Norand Reference C discloses hand-held computers that have access to the Internet for browsing, surfing, and communicating. (See Norand Reference C, page 2, paragraph 1). However, Norand Reference A and Norand Reference C do not disclose or suggest a webpage configured to display a service request status, as in claim 28. Additionally, Norand Reference B and Norand Reference D do not disclose or suggest a webpage configured to display a service request status, as in claim 28. Further, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest a web page configured to display a service request status. Therefore, Norand References A, B, C, D, and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 28.

Further, the Office Action admits that the Norand References do not disclose that a dispatcher is receiving a status update via a webpage. See Office Action, page 30. The Office takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to use web pages to display information based on receiving information over the internet. See Office Action, page 30. Applicants traverse the assertion of Official Notice.

Official Notice unsupported by documentary evidence should only be taken by the Examiner where the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common knowledge in the art are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. See MPEP 2144.03 (A). It would not be appropriate for the Examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. *Id.* It is never appropriate to rely solely on "common knowledge" in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based. See *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, and MPEP 2144.03 (A). The Examiner must provide specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support his or her conclusion of common knowledge. See *Soli*, 317 F.2d at 946, and MPEP 2144.03 (B).

The Office has not provided any evidence to support a position of obviousness with regard to claim 28. For instance, Applicants submit that no evidence has been provided in the Office Action to support a position that a web page configured to display a service request status that is provided by an order status monitoring monitored module associated with service order

completion data and frame order completion data is "old and well known." Applicants submit that the cited portions of the Norand References and Lesaint fail to disclose or suggest the use of a web page configured to display a service request status. If Applicant adequately traverses the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice, the Examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office Action if the rejection is to be maintained. *See* 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). *See also Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1386, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 ("[T]he Board [or Examiner] must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings" to satisfy the substantial evidence test). "If the Examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support the finding of what is known in the art, the Examiner must provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding." *See* MPEP 2144.03C. Applicants submit that the assertion of Official Notice is improper, and should be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons presented above, claim 28 is allowable. Claims 29 and 41 depend from claim 28, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the Norand References and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of claims 29 and 41. Accordingly, claims 29 and 41 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 28.

In addition, the dependent claims include features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For example the cited portions of the Norand References and Lesaint fail to disclose or suggest at least one web page that displays a status of each of the first task and the second task, as in claim 41. In contrast to claim 41, Norand Reference A discloses transferring a copper phone line to a fiber optic phone line according to inputs entered at a remote hand-held computer via a digital switch at a central office. *See* Norand Reference A, page 2, paragraph 6. In further contrast, Norand Reference C discloses hand-held computers that have access to the Internet for browsing, surfing, and communicating. *See* Norand Reference C, page 2, paragraph 1. Norand Reference A and Norand Reference C do not disclose or suggest at least one web page that displays a status of each of a first task associated with service order completion data and a second task associated with frame order completion data. Additionally, Norand Reference B and Norand Reference D do not disclose or suggest at least one web page that displays a status of each of the first task associated with service order completion data and the second task

associated with frame order completion data. Further, Lesaint does not disclose or suggest this element of claim 41. For this additional reason, claim 41 is allowable.

The cited portions of the Norand References and Lesaint do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 38. For example, the cited portions of the Norand References do not disclose or suggest assigning a first task related to a service request to a first technician via a mobile technician interface and assigning a second task related to the service request to a second technician via a frame order management system interface, as in claim 38. In contrast to claim 38, Norand Reference A discloses assigning a single technician to transfer a certain number of copper lines to fiber optic lines. See Norand Reference A, page 3, paragraph 2. Further, the cited portions of Norand Reference B, Norand Reference C, and Norand Reference D do not disclose or suggest assigning a first task related to a service request to a first technician via a mobile technician interface and assigning a second task related to the service request to a second technician via a frame order management system interface, as in claim 38. Additionally, the cited portions of Lesaint do not disclose or suggest this element of claim 38. Hence, claim 38 is allowable.

Claim 39 depends from claim 38, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, the cited portions of the Norand References and Lesaint, separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 39. Accordingly, claim 39 is also allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 38.

Further, claim 39 includes additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For example, the cited portions of the Norand References and Lesaint do not disclose or suggest that the order status is shown as complete upon receipt of both the service order completion data and the frame order completion data, as in claim 39. In contrast, the cited portions of the Norand References and Lesaint fail to disclose or suggest receiving service order completion data associated with a first task related to the service request and receiving frame order completion data associated with a second task related to the service request. For this additional reason, claim 39 is allowable.

Attorney Docket No.: 1033-SS00401

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 17 2008****CONCLUSION**

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this response that have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

1-17-2008
Date


Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)